IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

FRIDAY, THE 26TH OCTOBER 2007 / 4TH KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 11311 of 2007(V)

PETITIONER:

ALPHONSA JOHNY,M/S.J.J.TIMBERS,
NEAR PANAMBILLY COLLEGE,POTTA P.O,PIN-680 772,
CHALAKUDY.

BY ADV. SRI.PRAMOD J.DEV
SRI.V.P.JOLY

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. THE GENERAL MANAGER,DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE,THRISSUR.

2. THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER,CHALAKUDY.

3. THE TAHSILDAR,TALUK OFFICE,MUKUNDAPURAM IRINJALAKUDA.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.GOVINDAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 26/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WPC NO.11311/07

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF the SSI PROVISIONAL REGISTRATION VIDENO.MU09014550/2001 DT.18.7.01 OF THE ASSISTANT DISTRICT INDUSTRIES OFFICER, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK.

EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE LICENCE U/S 447 OF THE KERALA MUNICIPALITY ACT.

EXT.P3: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION DT.2.1.04 ISSUED BY THE ADDL.SALES TAX OFFICER-II, CHALAKUDY.

EXT.P4: TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DT.22.1.2002.

EXT.P5: TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DT.27.12.2004.

EXT.P6: TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO.B1/639/04 DT.19.2.2004 OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXT.P7: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DT.31.1.05 IN WPC NO.3238/05 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.

EXT.P8: TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.G3-35943/03 DT.26.9.06 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXT.P9: TRUE COPY OF DEMAND NOTICE NO.G3-35943/03 DT.26.9.06 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

//TRUE COPY//

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.

==========

W.P.(C) NO. 11311 OF 2007 V

==========

Dated this the 26th day of October, 2007

J U D G M E N T

This writ petition was filed for quashing Exts. P8 and P9. Ext.P8 is an order of assessment under the Kerala Building Tax Act and Ext.P9 is the consequential demand notice. In the statement filed on behalf of the 3rd respondent, it is stated that realising that Ext.P8 assessment order was passed on account of a mistake, the same has since been cancelled. It is stated that consequently demand notice has also been recalled.

2. In view of the above, petitioner has no further grievance to be redressed in this writ petition.

3. In so far as the prayer for grant of NOC to the SSI unit of the petitioner is concerned, that is a matter for the 2nd respondent to consider. Accordingly, I leave the petitioner to pursue the said claim.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.

Rp